

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, and 11-20 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended herein. Claim 10 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed and at page 10, lines 17-22, page 11, lines 1-13, and Figs. 5A and 5B of the specification. Reconsideration is requested based on the following remarks.

Advisory Action Mailed June 19, 2006:

The Advisory Action mailed June 19, 2006 was sent to Jackson Walker L.L.P., even though a Power of Attorney notifying the Office of the correspondence address of the undersigned representatives of the Applicants has been on file since March 23, 2005. The Applicants request respectfully that all further correspondence in this application be sent to the undersigned representatives of the Applicants at the below-mentioned address.

The continuation sheet attached to the Advisory Action asserts at line 14 that:

Secondly, there is no language within the claim language that one task is not the same caller from before.

To the contrary, in claim 1, for example, the three data processing tasks are designated as a first, a second, and a third data processing task, respectively, to distinguish them from one another. Thus, when claim 1 recites, "the task switching function executing a return operation to the third data processing task," it is not executing a return operation to the same caller from before, i.e. either the first or the second data processing tasks.

The continuation sheet attached to the Advisory Action asserts further at lines 19 and 20 that:

Fleck allows for the interrupt handler, first task, and the second task to all call a return instruction wherein the data processing unit returns an address and context of the *previous executing task*. (Emphasis added).

Thus, the data processing unit in Fleck returns an address and context of the *previous executing task*, as noted in the Advisory Action. This is to be contrasted with the claimed invention, in which "the task switching function execut(es) a return operation to the third data processing task," rather than either of the previously executing tasks. Even an interrupt or a trap handler will return to the previously executing tasks. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, are disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fleck et al., US 6,128,641 (hereinafter "Fleck"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites:

The task switching function executing a return operation to the third data processing task.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the task switching function executing a return operation to the third data processing task," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-8 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11-16:

Claim 11 recites:

The memory management apparatus responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processor.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the memory management apparatus responsive to said instruction information indicating a return instruction for moving said return address from said second storage location to a register of the data processor," as recited in claim 11. Claim 11 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 12-16 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 recites:

The task switcher switching from execution of the second task to execution of a third task, said memory having a storage location for storing a return address corresponding to the third task, and an input for receiving information indicative of instructions of a task switching function that has been called by the second task.

Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “the task switcher switching from execution of the second task to execution of a third task, said memory having a storage location for storing a return address corresponding to the third task, and an input for receiving information indicative of instructions of a task switching function that has been called by the second task,” as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck. Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and adds further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “the task switcher switching from execution of the second task to execution of a third task, said memory having a storage location for storing a return address corresponding to the third task, and an input for receiving information indicative of instructions of a task switching function that has been called by the second task,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. Claim 18 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 9 and 20:

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of “Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art.” Claims 9 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 17, respectively and add further distinguishing elements. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “the task switching function executing a return operation to the third data processing task,” as discussed above with respect to the rejections of claim 1. Fleck neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “the task switcher switching from execution of the second task to execution of a third task, said memory having a storage location for storing a return address corresponding to the third task, and an input for receiving information indicative of instructions of a task switching function that has been called by the second task,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17. The parts of the Application labeled “Prior Art” do not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Fleck with respect to claims 9 and 20. Claims 9

and 20 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Claims 1-9, and 11-20 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10 V L O 6

By: 

Thomas E. McKiernan

Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501